

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed January 7, 2005. Applicant amends claims 1, 8, 9, 11-15, 17, and 21. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Section 103 Rejections**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,757,525 issued to Matthews et al. ("*Matthews*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,231 issued to Gammel et al. ("*Gammel*").

A method for performing speaker verification based on speaker independent recognition of commands, the method comprising:

receiving, from a client, an utterance spoken by a speaker;

identifying a user associated with the client;

identifying a command associated with the utterance by performing speaker independent recognition (SIR);

determining whether a speaker verification template associated with the identified command includes adequate verification data to verify utterances of the identified command by the identified user;

eliminating a prompt for a password if the speaker verification template associated with the identified command includes adequate verification data; and

verifying a speaker identity by comparing the utterance with the speaker verification template associated with the identified command.

*Matthews* and *Gammel*, both alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of amended Claim 1 for at least several reasons. First, the proposed *Matthews-Gammel* combination fails to disclose "identifying a user associated with the client." *Matthews* discloses an electronic communication system that "enables the user to access the system through voice commands which are received and compared to prestored speaker independent digital templates." Abstract. As the Examiner notes, the cited portion of *Matthews* recites only:

means for associating in said digital memory means with each identification code a plurality of speaker independent voice templates, each speaker independent template including an associated set of values representative of the characteristic features of the audio signal produced by speaking one of a plurality of command words

first means for receiving from a telephone station of the system voice commands of a user attempting access

first comparing means for comparing said received spoken voice commands with the speaker independent digital templates

means for allowing access to the system by the user attempting access to the system when the received spoken voice commands compare true with a stored one of the speaker independent digital templates and the associated voice characteristics.

*Office Action*, pp. 2-3.

*Matthews* does not however disclose “identifying a user associated with the client.”

Moreover, combination with *Gammel* does not remedy this omission. *Gammel* discloses generally a system for “performing speaker verification on a spoken utterance.” Col 1, ll. 26-27. Nonetheless, as illustrated by Figure 3 of *Gammel*, the steps performed by *Gammel* in completing the “speaker verification” include only “retriev[ing] subscriber profile and verification template,” “accept[ing] utterance,” “retriev[ing] grammar,” and “perform[ing] recognition.” As a result, *Gammel* also fails to disclose “identifying a user associated with the client” as recited by amended Claim 1.

Second, the proposed *Matthews-Gammel* combination fails to disclose “eliminating a prompt for a password if a speaker verification template associated with the identified command includes adequate verification data.” According to the Examiner, *Matthews* “teaches where passwords (different from the user ID code) are only entered under certain circumstances[.]” *Office Action*, p. 3. *Matthews*, however, explicitly indicates what these circumstances are. As *Matthews* notes, “[i]f the password primitive has been activated in a function block described hereinbelow, the program flows along the “Y” path to a function wherein the password is entered.” Col. 69, ll. 36-39, emphasis added. Consequently, *Matthews* does not disclose “eliminating a prompt for a password if a speaker verification template associated with the identified command includes adequate verification data” as recited by amended Claim 1.

Similarly, *Gammel* fails to disclose “eliminating a prompt for a password if a speaker verification template associated with the identified command includes adequate verification data.” The cited portion of *Gammel* indicates only that “if . . . the minimum number of successfully matched digits or the minimum average score is not achieved, operation continues at block 76 where the user is requested to enter a pre-determined identifier.” Col. 3, ll. 30-33, emphasis added. Consequently, *Gammel* also does not disclose “eliminating a prompt for a password if a speaker verification template associated with the identified

command includes adequate verification data.” Consequently, the proposed *Matthews-Gammel* combination also fails to disclose “eliminating a prompt for a password if a speaker verification template associated with the identified command includes adequate verification data” as recited by amended Claim 1.

Thus, *Matthews* and *Gammel*, alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of amended Claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1 and its dependents.

Although of differing scope from Claim 1, Claims 8, 17, and 21 include elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed with respect to Claim 1, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references. Claims 8, 17, and 21 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 8, 17, and 21, and their respective dependents.

**Conclusions**

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTs L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant



Todd A. Cason  
Reg. No. 54,020

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980  
(214) 953-6509

Date: 4/7/05

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

Customer Number:

**05073**